# Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter - Auditorium

# 101 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Oakland, California

December 7, 2011

#### **Members Present:**

Susan Adams, Supervisor, County of Marin

Andy Barnes, Policy Chair, Urban Land Institute

Shiloh Ballard, Silicon Valley Leadership Group

Ronit Bryant, Councilmember, City of Mountain View

Dave Cortese, Supervisor, County of Santa Clara/RPC Chair

Linda Craig, League of Women Voters Bay Area

Pat Eklund, Councilmember, City of Novato

Rose Jacobs Gibson, Supervisor, County of San Mateo

Mark Green, Mayor, City of Union City/ABAG Immediate Past President

Scott Haggerty, Supervisor, County of Alameda

John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Jennifer Hosterman, Mayor, City of Pleasanton

Nancy Kirshner-Rodriguez, Director of Government Affairs, City of San Francisco

Nate Miley, Supervisor, County of Alameda

Ross Mirkarimi, Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco

Anu Natarajan, Councilmember, City of Fremont

Julie Pierce, Vice Mayor, City of Clayton/ABAG Vice President

Harry Price, Mayor, City of Fairfield

Laurel Prevetti, Bay Area Planning Directors Association (BAPDA)

Tiffany Renee, Councilmember, City of Petaluma

A. Sepi Richardson, Councilmember, City of Brisbane/RPC Vice Chair

Mark Ross, Councilmember, City of Martinez

Pixie Hayward Schickele, California Teachers Association

Carol Severin, EBRPD Board of Directors

Allen Fernandez Smith, President & CEO, Urban Habitat

Jim Spering, Supervisor, County of Solano

Egon Terplan, Regional Planning Director, SPUR

Beth Walukas, Alameda County Transportation Commission

#### **Members Absent:**

Valerie Brown, Supervisor, County of Sonoma

Paul Campos, Sr. Vice President of Government Affairs, BIA Bay Area

Diane Dillon, Supervisor, County of Napa

Janet Kennedy, Councilmember, City of Martinez

Jeremy Madsen, Executive Director, Greenbelt Alliance

Andrew Michael, Bay Area Council

Nancy Nadel, Councilmember, City of Oakland

Linda Seifert, Supervisor, County of Solano

Gayle Uilkema, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa

#### **Staff Present:**

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director Miriam Chion, ABAG Principal Planner Gillian Adams, ABAG Regional Planner Justin Fried, ABAG Regional Planner Dayle Farina, ABAG Administrative Assistant

### 1. Call to Order/Introductions

• Chair Cortese called the meeting to order at 1:10 PM.

#### 2. Public Comment

# 3. Approval of Minutes for October 5, 2011

Approval of the minutes was moved by Committee Member Pierce and seconded by Committee Member Bryant.

Minutes of October 5, 2011, were approved as submitted.

# 4. Oral Reports/Comments

#### A. Committee Members

Committee Member Adams reported on the annual General Assembly for the California State Association of Counties. The Governor is putting together an initiative which will protect the local resources in relationship to realignment.

There is also a lot of discussion around pension reform as it relates to the public sector.

#### B. Staff

Ken Kirkey announced that ABAG & MTC are recipients of the HUD Sustainable Communities grant of nearly \$5 million. Work will commence next year.

Mr. Kirkey also reported that, on Monday, November 28 the Regional Water Quality Control Board approved a special project provision for infill development projects. Priority Development Areas are part of the criteria.

# 5. INFORMATION: Growing Smarter Together Awards

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director, said a few words about the Growing Smarter Together Awards and encouraged participation by the local jurisdictions. His comments were followed by the video of last year's winners, which was shown at the Spring General Assembly.

Chair Cortese encouraged members to have their jurisdictions apply for these awards.

Committee Member Price requested that the DVD be made accessible to the League of California Cities for the Planners Institute. He would also like a personal copy to take back to his planning commission.

Mr. Kirkey will follow-up on this request.

# 6. INFORMATION: Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) – Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Update

Miriam Chion, ABAG Principal Planner and Gillian Adams, ABAG Regional Planner presented an update of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation process as it relates to the SCS.

Committee Member Green requested a copy of the Public Workshop schedule be distributed to the Committee members.

Committee Member Prevetti asked if, at the February 1, 2012 RPC meeting, there could be discussion about the Preferred Scenario so that the Committee's input could be heard prior to the March release?

Mr. Kirkey responded that the Public Workshops are running until the end of January and all of the input won't have been compiled by February 1. However, information will be shared as much as possible.

Committee Member Adams commented that the Executive Board supported 25% to counties and 75% to cities in the last cycle. It was erroneously applied at 50/50 allocation. Ms. Adams would like it clarified what the actual decision was as the county will be sending a request to continue what was supported in the previous cycle.

Committee Member Eklund commented that the Marin County Cities would like to see the 50/50 split retained. If this is to change, she requests discussion around the change.

Committee Member Eklund asked if, on vacancy and foreclosed units, how this will be applied in the methodology throughout the region.

Ms. Chion responded that the number received from the state is much lower than anticipated. Calculations were based on 250,000 units and the actual allocation was 200,000. Vacant and foreclosed units are already accounted for in this number.

Committee Member Terplan asked if this will have an impact on the allocation of units within the region. For example; will those jurisdictions with a higher vacancy and foreclosure rate be allocated lower numbers?

Ms. Chion responded that it hasn't been addressed as part of the methodology; given the number received was such a low number, which would assume a high component

of vacancies and/or foreclosure. This can be discussed at the next Housing Methodology Committee (HMC).

Mr. Kirkey followed-up that this can be researched but that it would get very complicated. Jurisdictions can utilize vacant and foreclosed units as part of the planning process. It is expected that many jurisdictions will do this. Mr. Kirkey also explained the 75/25 split and how it was staff error that reported 50/50 to Sacramento.

Committee Member Ross commented that there is no distinguishing in housing needs between rental and owner-occupied units. At some point there needs to be a distinction between rentals and owner-occupied units.

# 7. INFORMATION: Sustainable Communities Strategy – Alternative Scenarios Employment Strategy

Justin Fried, ABAG Regional Planner, presented information on employment in the Alternative Scenarios, both the sector and geographic distribution in job growth.

Committee Member Pierce commented that adding houses to the remote areas which don't have many jobs doesn't make sense. We need to address how serious this region is about GHG, which is required as part of the SCS; and the preferred growth pattern which we and the bay area residents are willing to accept. She feels there is a tension between the ideal identified in the Initial Vision Scenario and where we are headed in the implementation.

Committee Member Pierce also voiced that it might be better to meet in early March than February so the RPC has a viable response to the process.

Ms. Chion responded that in the scenarios there is close correlation to have the housing growth where there is a concentration of employment.

Chair Cortese asked Mr. Kirkey to comment on the thought about moving the meeting date.

Mr. Kirkey responded that we can move the meeting if that is the desire of the Committee.

Committee Member Prevetti commented that as the Preferred Scenario is discussed, as much as it is about the new increment of growth that we need to see it in the context of what we already have.

Committee Member Bryant asked if that within the jobs numbers, if it is possible to add the people working from home. Ms. Bryant added that people change jobs pretty frequently and asked how this impacts the numbers.

Mr. Fried responded that information about self-employment is becoming more available.

On people moving jobs – it is more attractive to the individual worker if jobs in the same industry are near each other as it makes it easier to move around within that sector. This is part of the economic benefit of having more jobs concentrated near transit.

Committee Member Terplan asked if the RPC will have a chance to talk about some of the policies which underlay the changes in the distribution.

Ms. Chion responded that at the March meeting we will hopefully have a preliminary set of policies that accompany economic development strategies and the affordable housing production strategy.

Committee Member Kirshner-Rodriguez asked about PDAs and Growth Opportunity Areas, etc. (A more detailed summary of her comments is not possible due to microphone/recording problem)

Mr. Fried responded that PDAs and Growth Opportunity Areas are both reflected here.

Mr. Kirkey commented that going forward, there is a process in place where the Growth Opportunity Areas can be submitted for approval as PDAs.

Committee Member Eklund commented that workplace will take a turn toward more people telecommuting by 2013 which she feels challenges the idea about employment being centered near transit going forward and that telecommuting should be figured into the Housing Methodology.

Mr. Kirkey responded that more employment information is being considered than before, on a regional level.

Committee Member Hosterman agrees that jobs will take a back seat to transit going forward and considering homes in close proximity to transit will be more important. Ms. Hosterman asked if, in terms of determining success - - what is the formula for success?

Mr. Kirkey responded that currently half of the priority development areas are planned at the neighborhood level. What's needed for this process is adequate money to roll out this project at the neighborhood level and a programmatic EIR so that when the economy turns around it will be known what is needed to get the project approved.

Committee Member Richardson asked that the power point presentation be sent to the members.

Committee Member Adams commented that 20% of traffic is parents driving children to school. Ms. Adams thinks we need to look at the housing in relation to schools.

Ms. Adams added that another issue is the aging population and what it means for how the senior citizens are getting to their destinations. We need to look at our growth patterns in a way that are changing with the times.

Committee Member Fernandez Smith would like to see how small business fits into this model.

Mr. Fried commented that job growth in the region is more attributed to business start-ups and businesses growing than relocation.

Committee Member Ross commented that if more rental units were created around transit centers, that would contribute more to reducing the commute shed. The incentive for a community to create rental units in a project might be that they get credit for 2 or 3 units per rental unit since the tenancy will likely turnover several times within a 10 year period.

Committee Member Spering added that a cost analysis is needed. Mr. Spering also asked if we have done an inventory about what jurisdictions want this kind of growth and match it with what is being proposed.

Mr. Kirkey responded that a lot of feedback was received from local jurisdictions on the Initial Vision Scenario, which provided input on this issue. Input from those jurisdictions is reflected in Alternative 3, 4 or 5.

# **ADJOURN:**

Chair Cortese adjourned the meeting at 2:56 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for February 1, 2011 with the possibility of rescheduling it to March 7, 2011.

Submitted by:

Dayle Farina

Administrative Assistant